DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 268 769 EC 182 374

AUTHOR Barkin, Thelma M.
TITLE Research and Evaluation of PX Professional Exchange Program, 1981-1985.
PUB DATE 85
NOTE 119p.; A formal paper based on this document was presented at the Annual Convention of the Council for Exceptional Children (64th, New Orleans, LA, March 31-April 4, 1986).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Diagnostic Teaching; *Disabilities; High Schools; Interpersonal Relationship; *Language Arts; *Mainstreaming; *Program Development; Program Effectiveness; Teaching Methods; *Team Teaching; Writing (Composition)

ABSTRACT

The report presents the history and accomplishments of a mainstreaming program involving an exchange of professional skills among a special education teacher and four regular education teachers of high school English classes in Milford, Massachusetts. Based on results of a teacher survey, a team-teaching program was devised which stressed a diagnostic-prescriptive approach in the regular classroom. Five goals are reviewed: (1) to provide the classroom teacher with assistance for successful program implementation with special needs and low functioning regular education students; (2) to develop accommodations in the regular classroom and the resource room for mainstreamed special students; (3) to develop a classroom survival skills curriculum; (4) to develop a diagnostic approach to secondary language arts programing; and (5) to create a model language arts program. Each of the four participating classes is described. Six questions from student and parent questionnaries are analyzed in depth, regarding employment of reading and writing, homework, and the value of the student's present English class in improving written language skills. Program evaluation results revealed that the greatest gains on writing skills tests were made by students in the mainstream team teaching program for more than 1 year. Recommendations are offered for parent involvement and the inclusion of a developmental reading component in academic content areas. Appendixes include excerpts from the Resource Room Support Service Program and from study guides, program packets, book report forms, and questionnaires. (CL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ED268769

Research and Evaluation

of

PX Professional Exchange Program

1981-1985

Departments of Special Education and English

Milford High School

Milford, MA 01757

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Thelma M. Barkin

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Thelma M. Barkin M.Ed.

EC 182374

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	I.
I. NARRATIVE:	1
Audit and Workshops	1
Rationale For Mainstream Program	3
Teacher Survey	5
Team Teacher Visitations	17
Initial Goals of The Program	18
General Description of The Mainstream Program	19
II. DESCRIPTIONS OF FOUR CLASSES: SIMILARITIES AND DIFFERENCES	24
#113 Freshman Program	26
#123 Sophomore Program	29
#153 Junior Program	32
#154 Senior Program	36
III. COMPUTER ANALYSIS OF PROGRAM	41
Table 1	42
Does The Student Enjoy Reading?	
Table 2	44
Does The Student Enjoy Writing?	
Table 3	46
How Do Student's Written Language Skills Compare to Other Students at Milford High School?	

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

Page

Table 4 48

Is Your Present English Class Helping You To Improve These Skills?

Table 5 49

Does Your Child Ask For Help With His Homework?

Table 6 52

Have You Ever Participated In Any of These Classes? Title 1, ESL, etc...

IV. RESEARCH PROJECT 55

Table 7 57

Basic Skills Testing: Pre and Post Writing Skills Tests

V. SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS 63

VI. NOTES 73

VII. BIBLIOGRAPHY 74

VIII. APPENDIX 75

I.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This study is the result of a common belief and combined efforts of all of the people who have participated: administrators, teachers, aides, psychologists, guidance counselors and students. Dr. Peck, Professor of Education, Boston College Graduate School of Arts and Sciences, who supervised the independent study long after his initial commitment was fulfilled, has provided the skilled overview that has given the study its form and goals. I am grateful for the encouragement and cooperation of these dedicated colleagues.

Mention must also be made of the contributions of my husband, Alan S. Barkin, without whose support and encouragement this study would not have been possible.

Administrators: Dr. Cimino, Superintendent of Schools

Robert Pagnini, Milford High School, Principal

Joyce Phillips, Milford High School, Assistant Principal

David Hayes, Milford High School, Assistant Principal

Paul Weiner, Milford Public Schools, Special Education Director

Faculty Members:	P. Marie Colavita, English Department Chairman, teacher
	Mary Ann Tebeau, English Department Chairman, teacher
	Robert McGee, English Department, teacher
	Patrick Griffin, Exchange teacher, England
	John Bisiccia, English Department, teacher
	James McCallum, English Department, teacher
	Judy Innis, Special Education teacher
	Joseph Stoico, Special Education teacher
	Edward Theroux, Special Education teacher
	Susan Fontana, English and Social Studies teacher
Aides:	Josephine Veneziano
	Pauline Bulso
Guidance Counselors:	George Anderson, Director
	Barbara Ciesla, Counselor
	Charles Espanet, Counselor
	Matt O'Connor, Counselor
	Dr. John DeSalvia, Counselor
Psychologists:	Susan Taylor
	Gary Castiglione
	Frank Nealon
	William Conners

I. NARRATIVE

Audit and Workshops

During the school year 1979-80, the Department of Special Education, Commonwealth of Massachusetts, conducted a program audit of the Milford Public Schools. The committee identified problem areas, as well as praising other identified areas. In particular the high school Special Needs program received commendation.

However, one area of weakness was singled out, and indeed it was apparent that it was a weak area. The audit committee stated the problem area in the following terms:

> ". . .there is no continuity of level for lower language functioning students when transferring from the Middle School to the High School. . ." 1.

The Audit Committee recommendation was

> ". . .to develop an academic program for lower language functioning students, which complements the appropriate Middle School levels. . ." 2.

Miss Colavita, who was chairman of the English Department at that time, met with Ms. Barkin, Ch. 766 Chairperson at the high school, to explore options to meet the challenge presented. A committee was formed to assist the chairpersons with representatives from the Special Ed department and the administration. The committee concluded that the problem was not inappropriate course levels, but that students were functioning at low language

levels and were experiencing difficulty and failure in high school English and Social Studies courses. Often the students did not display overt language impairments, but generalized weaknesses in receptive, integrative, and expressive language skills.

A series of workshops was scheduled, funded by Technical Assistance funds and PL 94-142 monies, in order to identify the population, implement a language program and adapt curriculum. Faculty members, department heads of the English, Social Studies, Reading, Speech and Special Education Departments met and shared information. On April 29, 1980, experts in the field of learning/language disabilities, Mr. and Mrs. Martin Weiss, conducted a workshop for the faculties of the Middle School and High School: "Survival Techniques for the Transition: Middle School to High School". The workshop presented some methods that could be used by the classroom teacher to gear work to the student's strengths, compensatory skills and interests; it focused on successful skill mastery rather than failure.

Following the workshop, readability levels were ascertained for Social Studies texts in current use at the high school to establish the instructional range. Some texts were found to be at 10th, 11th, 12th, 13th grade. Students in these courses, struggling with these texts, were scoring at 4th to 6th grade reading levels on Woodcock Reading Tests or Wide Range Achievement tests. There was a poor match between the ability levels and materials indicating a need to adapt currently-used materials and to obtain more suitable texts.

Rationale for Mainstream Program

Another proposal for program modification in response to the audit recommendation was a direct service model. In October, 1979, a Resource-room teacher and a Social Studies teacher had agreed to participate in an experiment to build upon their team-teaching experience as input for the development of a future mainstreaming program. In January, 1980, a different Resource-room teacher and an English teacher had participated in this program under similar conditions and expectations.

The rationale for the team-teaching model was that the curriculum modification for Special Needs students at the high school level is more complex than at the middle school and elementary levels. Many special educators do not have expertise in the subject areas; many regular educators do not have expertise in Special Education. An excerpt from the Journal of Special Education, Summer, 1979, p. 14 quoted the following: "In the context of mainstreaming, the skills levels of the regular classroom teacher are critical . . . to the extent that the regular classroom teachers do not possess the skills for dealing with the handicapped children in their charge, the mere paper compliance with the mandates of Public Law 94-142 is increased . . ." 3.

In order to clarify English department and Special Education department policies and practices relating to services for Special Needs students and other low-language functioning students and to improve communication between departments, a survey of teachers of the English department was conducted by the Special Needs Generic Teacher. The survey attempted to focus on attitudes of the teachers toward Special Needs students who were serviced in the regular classroom. For these students the regular classroom had been determined the "least restrictive alternative placement" as mandated by PL 94-142, which became fully effective in 1977. The questionnaire also evaluated the present interaction of the Special Education program with the total school organization: how it affected and was affected by the larger educational milieu in which it was operating.

Nine members of the English department were interviewed. There appeared to be legitimate responses, not responses made simply to complete the survey, but thoughtful and serious ones . . . to begin the process of improving the delivery of services to this population. The resulting information would be used in decision-making concerning the mainstream team-teaching model.

TEACHER SURVEY

1. HAVE YOU HAD MUCH CONTACT WITH CH. 766 STUDENTS? WHAT % ARE IN YOUR CLASSES?

All teachers interviewed had some contact with 766 students ranging from 5 to 15% of students in their regular classes. However, several teachers noted fluctuations in enrollment from year to year.

2. IN WHAT WAYS DID THE SPECIAL NEEDS SERVICES PROVIDED ASSIST THE REGULAR CLASSROOM TEACHER?

Most teachers agreed that the Resource-room teacher assisted the student best when close contact was made with the academic teacher concerning classroom activities. The classroom teacher indicated that the Resource-room teacher could give more individualized attention to the Special Needs student, could accommodate the acting-out student, and prepare a reentering student. One teacher expressed a strong negative opinion. Another stated that efforts were duplicated, but not simultaneous because of lack of coordination. Another teacher indicated that reenforcement was subverted by confusing the student with different terminology used in the resource-room or the resource teacher's lack of preparation in the skill area.

It is interesting to note that the question asked if the Resource-room teacher was providing assistance to the regular classroom teacher, and the teachers responded that the student was receiving the help, not the teacher.

3. DO YOU SHARE THE RESULTS OF CH. 766 TESTING WITH THE SPECIAL NEEDS DEPARTMENT? FORMALLY OR INFORMALLY?

The teachers were negative toward value of sharing sophisticated testing for classroom purposes. However, several teachers expressed interest in skills testing as having practical value in the classroom.

4. DO YOU FEEL THAT SUPPORT SERVICES IN THE RESOURCE ROOM ARE BENEFITING SPECIAL NEEDS STUDENTS? WHAT KINDS OF SUPPORT SERVICES DO THEY NEED? (This question specifically referred to the student).

Teachers were evenly divided on this question. Fifty percent (50%) thought support services were beneficial; the other half that it was only an improvement over free time in study hall.

5. ARE SIMILAR SUPPORT SERVICES OFFERED IN THE REGULAR CLASSROOM? COULD THEY BE OFFERED IN THE REGULAR CLASSROOM?

Most teachers responded that similar skills are taught when time and class size permitted. The answers explained why skills are not taught on an organized basis. One teacher admitted an inability to identify individual student needs in a classroom. To teach these skills a teacher suggested the help of another teacher in order to divide into smaller groups in low-level classes.

6. DOES THE STUDENT WITH AN IEP DIFFER GREATLY FROM THE OTHER STUDENTS IN THE CLASSROOM?

Responses were 50% "Yes" and 50% "No." Some teachers could readily identify the IEP students as slower learners, particularly in a middle-level class. However, there were some students who went unrecognized until a crisis point was reached in the regular classroom. Most teachers agreed that the IEP student required more of the teacher's time. One teacher suggested that a ratio be established of a maximum of three Special Needs students per class.

7. HOW WILL RESULTS OF BASIC SKILLS TESTING AFFECT THE COURSE THAT YOU TEACH?

In response to this question the teachers were in complete agreement that there had been no effect on course content from basic skills testing. Teachers were not directly informed of results, nor did they know what sub-skills were being tested. Some teachers said that they would use results to evaluate students and would emphasize skill areas if information were shared. Note: Teachers would be aware of language functioning of regular students in class if they shared results of basic skills testing -- this information is available to all teachers in student folders in the Guidance Office records room.

8. HOW KNOWLEDGEABLE DO YOU FEEL THAT YOU ARE CONCERNING CH. 766 AND PL 94-142 LEGISLATED SERVICES TO SPECIAL EDUCATION STUDENTS? PROTOTYPES?

Three of the respondents expressed that they had adequate knowledge. The other six respondents expressed lack of knowledge.

9. WOULD YOU BE INTERESTED IN LEARNING MORE ABOUT THE LAW?

There were two unqualified positive responses. Other responses included emphatic negative and qualified negative responses. For example, two teachers had no time to learn about the laws.

10. IN YOUR CLASSROOM CAN YOU INDIVIDUALIZE A PROGRAM TO ACCOMMODATE SPECIAL NEEDS STUDENTS? HOW?

Teachers responses indicated difficulty of individualizing programs in low-level classes because of size, curriculum demands, and time constraints. Only two teachers saw possibilities by adapting materials and following educational plans.

11. DO YOU GRADE A SPECIAL NEEDS STUDENT DIFFERENTLY? WHAT CRITERIA DO YOU USE?

Only three teachers, a third of the group, graded Special Needs students differently.

12. DOES YOUR COURSE GRADE DEPEND HEAVILY UPON HOMEWORK?

Only one teacher placed a heavy emphasis on homework assignments. Others placed only a slight emphasis; one third or one fourth of course grade was the emphasis of another teacher. Three teachers did not assign homework at all.

13. DO YOU PROVIDE IN-CLASS TIME FOR BEGINNING AND COMPLETING HOMEWORK ASSIGNMENTS?

Three teachers seldom provided time; but other teachers usually did. (Note: Often IEP students bring homework assignments to the resource-room for help but do not know what has been asked of them. Many language-disabled regular and Special Education students require modeling sessions before attempting an independent learning activity, e.g., a homework assignment.)

14. HAVE THERE BEEN SPECIAL SITUATIONS WITH THE STUDENTS CONCERNING THEIR SPECIAL NEEDS? WITH PARENT?

Fifty percent (50%) of the teachers responded that there had been special situations with the students concerning their special needs. One teacher stated that these incidents were mostly over behavioral issues. According to respondents parents were never involved.

15. HOW DID YOU DEAL WITH THE SITUATION? WITH WHOM DID YOU DEAL?

Scattered responses indicated that teachers had no standard procedures for dealing with Special Education students' problems. Some consulted the guidance counselor; some reported the incidents or problem to the administrator; one did not consult with the Special Education department. One very negative response added, "none have ever worked because of time." (Note: Each Special Education student has an assigned Special Education Coordinator and a psychologist, in addition to a guidance counselor.)

16. HOW CAN COMMUNICATION BETWEEN THE SPECIAL NEEDS DEPARTMENT AND CLASSROOM TEACHERS IMPROVE?

Some suggestions were as follows: (1) written communication forms; (2) on a departmental basis; (3) better communication about classroom assignments between Resource-room teacher and academic teacher; (4) Special Education teacher participation in the classroom; (5) regular monthly meetings. One teacher cautioned that improved communication would not improve spontaneously. To carry the idea further, the teacher suggested that a process had to be worked out with official sanction.

17. HOW CAN RESPONSIBILITY FOR THE PROGRESS OF A CH. 766 STUDENT BE SHARED BY SPECIAL EDUCATION AND REGULAR EDUCATION TEACHERS IN THE EVENT THAT PROPOSITION 2 1/2 CUTS BACK SERVICES?

Four teachers suggested that Ch. 766 students be scheduled into the same class, with a Special Education

teacher who would offer direct service in the classroom. Options might include periodic visiting or daily teaching in conjunction with the classroom teacher. Others suggested conferencing with the academic teacher, adapting texts, consulting about individualizing the program, teaching a particular lesson to the whole class, utilizing the Special Needs teacher as a resource person.

18. HOW DO YOU VIEW THE ROLE OF THE GENERIC TEACHERS?

Three teachers viewed the Generic Teacher as a diagnostician performing student assessments. One teacher viewed the role as that of a guide for the regular teacher in obtaining materials and information, a resource person. Four teachers did not respond.

19. HOW DO YOU VIEW THE ROLE OF THE RESOURCE-ROOM TEACHER?

Teachers viewed the Resource-room teacher as a support person gearing to solve problems of student, providing more individualized help, and sharing responsibility of Special Needs students with the teacher. Four teachers did not respond.

20. ARE THERE SIMILARITIES AND DIFFERENCES IN GENERIC AND RESOURCE-ROOM TEACHERS' RELATIONSHIPS WITH CLASSROOM TEACHERS?

One teacher responded that the "person", not the title, made the difference. Some viewed the roles as being

similar; another viewed the roles as having differences. One teacher perceived the Generic Teacher as a support person, and perceived the resource room teacher as an aide to the teacher in working with the student. Four teachers did not respond.

21. WHICH ROLE IS MORE HELPFUL TO THE TEACHER? WHICH ROLE IS MORE HELPFUL TO THE STUDENT?

Several teachers who responded misread the questions. They interpreted them to read, "Which role is more helpful to the student? The regular education teacher or the Special Education teacher?" Regular education teachers responded critically to the role of the Special Education teachers.

One teacher responded, "They work with two to seven students. I work with twenty-five per mod." The implication appears to be that Special Education teachers have an easier job than the regular education teacher.

Another teacher responded, "The Resource-room teacher should be more helpful."

The teachers who correctly responded to the questions found both the Generic and Resource-room teachers necessary and helpful. Four teachers did not respond.

22. IF A STUDENT HAS BEEN IN AN ENGLISH RESOURCE-ROOM COURSE THE PREVIOUS YEAR . . . BEFORE ENTERING YOUR CLASSROOM . . . WOULD YOU LIKE THAT INFORMATION? (Note: Resource-room courses offer academic courses for credit in a small group setting.) WOULD YOU GRADE THE STUDENT DIFFERENTLY?

All nine teachers would like to be informed if the student had received credit for the previous year's English

course in the resource-room setting. However, three teachers would not grade the student differently. Others might grade the student differently depending on the situation. (This information is also available in the student Special Education file in the guidance office. Teachers are requested to consult the file of a specific student during the month of September.)

23. WHEN A STUDENT IS RETURNED TO THE MAINSTREAM, TO THE REGULAR CLASSROOM FOR ENGLISH, WHAT KIND OF SERVICES SHOULD BE PROVIDED TO HIM, BOTH REGULAR EDUCATION AND SPECIAL EDUCATION, TO ASSIST INTEGRATION?

There were several suggestions from the teachers. One proposed that the month of September should be devoted to inform the regular teacher, in layman's terms, of Special Education services for the student. Then, the Special Education teacher could begin to work with the student and the teacher in October, whether by monitoring or by direct service. Another suggestion was that both departments had the responsibility to work this problem out. One teacher commented that the mainstream is reflective of the outside world.

24. WHOM DO YOU FEEL SHOULD PROVIDE ADAPTED MATERIALS FOR THE SPECIAL NEEDS STUDENT? WHAT KIND OF MATERIALS WOULD BE HELPFUL?

One teacher was satisfied that sufficient materials were provided in the regular low-level classroom. Another

teacher's concern was the dearth of vocabulary and high interest/low-level reading materials. Two teachers requested the Special Education teacher adapt materials with the cooperation of the regular education teacher, perhaps during a special summer workshop. Four teachers did not respond.

25. WOULD A SIX DAY MOD SCHEDULE WHICH INCLUDED FIVE DAYS OF REGULAR CLASSROOM INSTRUCTION AND ONE DAY OF TUTORIAL INSTRUCTION BENEFIT THE MAINSTREAM AND REGULAR PROGRAM?

Two teachers replied that they would be in favor if the program was only for low groups. One teacher saw it as an alternative to the team-teaching model. Another teacher was opposed to the change. Others were unsure.

26. WHAT KIND OF CERTIFICATION/QUALIFICATION/CHARACTERISTICS DO YOU THINK WOULD MAKE A PERSON EFFECTIVE IN WORKING WITH SPECIAL NEEDS STUDENTS IN THE REGULAR CLASSROOM?

Some responses were:

- "certification in subject area"
- "knowledge of subject area"
- "ability to recognize individual problems, emotional and academic."
- "knowledge of basic skills."
- "inservice workshops"

One teacher responded that the regular education teachers had not taken Special Education courses and felt negatively. They tended to feel that the Special Needs student has been thrust upon them. This teacher supported a team-teaching model because it would raise the "comfort level" of the regular classroom teacher.

A presentation by the University of Kansas Research Institute for Research on Learning Disabilities, at the April, 1981, annual meeting of the Council for Exceptional Children held in New York City, cited from their study "that language-disabled students in the regular classroom perceived less approval from the classroom teacher and were less happy in the regular classroom than non language-disabled students." 4

Did these Kansas students correctly interpret their interaction with the teachers? Was less teacher approval related to the insecurity of the teachers when confronted with this student population? Were the members of the faculty of MHS who were surveyed reflecting a national trend? The responses to the survey questions appear to be consistent with the Kansas findings.

The following unsolicited summary was offered by one of the MHS teachers interviewed and serves as a reminder of the responsibility placed upon the regular classroom teacher on a daily basis. It further annotates the dilemma of the regular

academic teacher as s/he carries out the mandates of Ch. 766 and PL 94-142. The comments are in regard to attitudes of some teachers in low-level classes:

> "babysit them . . . keep 'em busy . . . when you put all those low-level kids in one room with lots of problems and negative attitudes . . . if they come (to school or class) . . . they will never learn anyhow . . . give 'em something to read and that's all . . ."

> "How much teaching and learning will take place? . . . poor attention span . . . discipline problems . . . lack of mental ability . . .
> even if course were repeated, the student still wouldn't get it . . . e.g. subject/verb agreement . . ."

> "The goals of low-level classes are to teach certain things . . . stick to a syllabus, but the reality is survival. There are no academic expectations from teachers, students, parents and administrators. People who are not involved in daily classroom teaching do not recognize the frustrations and strain of the regular teacher to deal with deeprooted complex problems . . ."

Team-teacher Visitations

The results of the survey were discussed and a proposal was written for a team-teaching program as a model for meeting some of the needs indicated. Visitations to three schools were made in order to observe three different models of high school team-teaching programs: Danvers, Lynnfield, and Walpole. During the summer Ms. Barkin and Ms. Colavita wrote the objectives for the Milford High School adaptation of the models that we had visited.

The program began in September, 1981, and continues to function to the present, October, 1985. It was undertaken and is staffed by the Generic Specialist and four English teachers who had volunteered to participate. The teachers have conducted a self-evaluation research project under the aegis of Dr. Alec Peck, Professor of Education, Boston College Graduate School of Arts and Sciences.

This study will be completed in October, 1985. The results will be shared with the High School administration and School Committee. A formal paper will be presented at the Annual State Conference of the Council for Exceptional Children in November, 1985, in Framingham, Massachusetts. It will be presented in April, 1986, in New Orleans at the International Conference of CEC. This paper will be submitted for publication to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC).

Initial Goals of the Program

How well we have met the original objectives of the program is one of the focuses of this research project. The following list were the five initial goals:

1. To provide the classroom teacher with assistance for successful implementation of programs for both Special Needs students and low-functioning regular education students.

   (a). To provide the classroom teacher with diagnostic and assessment techniques and interpretation of testing that may be useful to implement a developmental Language Arts program.

   (b). To focus on basic skills competency testing content and results in the planning of the Language Arts curriculum to meet the needs of the students.

2. To develop accommodations in the regular classroom and the resource-room for Special Needs students mainstreamed into the regular classroom. These strategies will effectively meet the needs of the other students with receptive, processing, and expressive language problems in the regular classroom.

3. To develop a classroom survival skills curriculum that will foster appropriate student classroom behaviors in response to specific classroom demands.

4. To develop a diagnostic approach to secondary Language Arts programming so that curriculum is developed and reviewed periodically as it relates to student progress.

5. To create a model Language Arts program which has potential for application to other secondary disciplines.

General Description of the Mainstream Program

The Milford High School PX Professional Exchange Program is a mainstreaming curriculum component involving a cross-exchange of professional skills between a Generic Special Education teacher and four regular education English teachers within four regular high school Language Arts classrooms, grades nine through twelve. For the 1982-83 school year there were ninety students enrolled; one-fourth, or twenty-two students, had Individualized Educational Plans.

The team-teaching program has stressed the diagnostic-prescriptive approach in the regular classroom. This Special Education approach to regular education programming follows the principle that "Special Education will be a resource for the entire school population and not an isolated body of skills and knowledge adjusted to a minute population." 5

All classes are administered reading and spelling tests on an ongoing basis through the school year. Students are responsible for scoring and graphing gains. There is considerable

interest and satisfaction in this activity. Students in the program for three years have tracked their scores and can realistically appraise their skill levels. It is interesting to note that most students with IEP's are not significantly different from others in the regular classroom. Lovitt, 1978, cited a study that supported mainstream placement "if the student can read as well as 25% of the class and has study skills as compared to other students placed within the setting." 6

An original objective of the program was to provide the classroom teacher with assistance for successful implementation of programs for the Special Needs students (prototypes 502.1, 502.2, 502.3, & 502.4) and other low-functioning regular education students who had not been referred for Chapter 766 evaluations, or had received Special Education services in earlier grades and were no longer receiving services.

Within these regular education classes are bilingual students who may or may not attend English as a Second Language classes, and other students who have not met Basic Competency Test standards. Those students who have not met the basic skill requirements may also receive Chapter I services in reading and math. Some students in the mainstream classes had received one or more of the previously mentioned support services in Middle or Elementary school. (see Table 6, page 52)

Specific materials adapted to the abilities and needs of the students were planned and constructed by the coordinated efforts of the Generic Teacher and the regular classroom teacher with English and Special Education departmental cooperation. Results of diagnosis and assessment were shared that would be useful in implementation of a developmental Language Arts program. Holistically scored writing samples, as well as results of Reading and Writers's Skills Basic Skills Competency Tests, were also utilized in the planning of curriculum components.

Types of materials adapted and made available to the classroom teachers were study guides of novels, writing packets for the senior writing program, A "Write Me a Ream" unit for the junior writing program; outlining, notetaking, listening, and study skills units; and a teacher-constructed spelling, vocabulary and writing program for the #113 freshman class. Some of these materials were tried on an experimental basis and have since been incorporated into the regular English program when the appropriateness of the content and success of the unit was demonstrated.

On-going assessment and evaluation established individual and group goals toward mastery of content. Pre and post-testing of spelling, reading and writing skills in all four mainstreamed classes provided graphic demonstration of progress for students,

teachers, and parents. The following standardized and criterion reference tests were used: Brigance Inventory; McCall-Crabbs Reading tests; Morison-McCall Spelling Scales; Malcomesius subtests, Test of Adolescent Language (TOAL). Strategies were devised to accomodate the special needs of those students with identified receptive, processing, and expressive language deficiencies. Progress or lack of progress was observed and noted. The students were aware that their progress toward mastery was graphed from September to June and they took great pride when skill improvement was indicated.

A resource-room "Survival Skills" curriculum was developed which fostered appropriate student classroom behaviors in response to specific regular classroom demands as the Special Needs student returned to the mainstream. (see Appendix) Team teaching in the regular class, plus support service in the resource room, have enhanced the instruction and diminished the disciplinary problems of the mainstream classroom.

In addition to materials, the Generic Teacher consulted with the team teacher about specific limitations or learning styles of these students. The mainstream program was an opportunity for the Special Education Coordinator to observe the Special Needs student in the mainstream: What was his social affect? Was he interacting with the other students? Was his behavior inappropriate? Through daily observations the Generic Teacher was in a better position to make recommendations to other teachers and parents at team

meetings, or on progress reports, for altering the environment or changing services.

The team teachers may have referred other students in the class for Ch. 766 evaluations after modifications in the regular classroom failed to meet the needs of a student. Or, many times a 766 evaluation was unnecessary when a specific problem was helped by referral to Chapter I. When a regular education student in this class had a weakness which could be solved on a short-term basis, that student received extra help from the Generic Teacher during the student's study period, or during an activity period. Examples of needs would include outlining, notetaking, organizational skills and paragraphing. The Special Education conference room has become a resource center for many regular education students in this program, as well as for others who have been referred by guidance counselors and classroom teachers. It is an informal pre-referral model that is a by-product of the mainstream program.

II. DESCRIPTIONS OF FOUR CLASSES: SIMILARITIES AND DIFFERENCES

The four classes although similar in many aspects were different in others. They were similar because the curriculum was prescribed; they were different as all classes differ from each other. The team teachers varied in their teaching styles, their presentation of the material, and their perceptions of the team-teacher interactions within each classroom. There were variations in the delivery of services in each classroom, but the team-teaching program was not dependent on similar teaching philosophies or matching personalities.

Many regular classroom and special education teachers view mainstreaming as an effective method only if there exists the right chemistry between the teachers and a sense of sharing responsibilities, giving and taking, flexibility. It is true that teachers who participate must be supportive of the program and have a sense of commitment. However, mainstream team teaching is not a rigid formalized method; it does not depend on any two particular teachers for its success. It has been easily adapted to the teaching styles of any two teachers who shared the commitment. In each case the dynamics of the relationship were different, but the results were the same. The students benefited from an enriched experience, and the teachers grew professionally.

In 1982-83, an exchange teacher from England taught the

#123 class with the Generic Teacher. Not only did this arrangement provide a smooth transition when Mr. Griffin came to Milford in December, but it also proved that the program itself is as significant as the participants. In 1983-84, a teacher who had taught in the mainstream program for two years took a sabbatical year to study in Europe. His replacement agreed to teach in the program. Continuity and success continued to flow, although the substitute teacher was skeptical at first.

In 1985-86 because of scheduling problems, most of the incoming freshment with IEP's had been scheduled with a non mainstream English teacher. Mrs. Vinson agreed to team teach for the first time this year. The original freshman team teacher, Miss Colavita, has agreed to further our study by providing the control group for our continued research.

General Description of #113 Freshmen Program

In this freshman English class the team teachers alternated mini-lessons during the forty-two minute mod. Freshmen in this group usually have extremely short attention spans; the teachers found that the change in content, teachers' voices, and deliveries produced increased attention span for the whole mod. For example, one teacher dictated the spelling/vocabulary lesson during the first twenty minutes, and then the other teacher gave a composition grammar lesson during the last section. On another day, during an oral reading lesson, one teacher read aloud as the class followed along in their books, while the other teacher had individual writing conferences or followed up homework assignments. As there tends to be some chronic absentees in the freshman classes, the opportunity was available to provide these students with directions for completing missing assignments on an individual basis.

In the second year of the program the team teachers adopted a strategy borrowed from the parent involvement encouraged by the Special Education process. Student essays which were assigned weekly were scored by the teacher, corrected by the student, and included in a packet of materials reviewed by the parent. The packet was returned each week signed by the parent to signify participation in our program. By involving the parent in a three-way cooperative effort, teacher, student, and parent,

the student was motivated to prepare the assignments and follow through with corrections. (see Appendix)

This same correction procedure, without parent involvement, was repeated in #153 and #154, and, in fact, originated in #154. This continuum of services is a unique feature of mainstreaming: some of the approaches originated in #113 have spilled over to #123 or wherever appropriate. There is an exchange of ideas and teacher-constructed materials.

The Freshman year is the most critical year for the team-teaching program. By state mandate middle school students require reassessment of basic skills. Formal Basic Skills Tests are administered in the fall of the Freshman year and results are received in January or February. However, in addition to the required testing, daily observations and diagnostic testing are an integral part of the mainstream program. It is a difficult transition from the middle school to the high school for many of these students. Some had IEP's in the lower grades and are no longer in the program. Some may need to be picked up again before frustration levels are reached. A study of the dropout population indicates that if we can keep the student through Grade 10, the critical period for leaving school has been weathered.

The regular academic teacher, post-Proposition 2 1/2, was teaching the low-level #113 class for the first time. She is an experienced English teacher, and former head of the English department. It was because of her interest in better servicing this population of students that the program was initiated. In May of 1984, the teacher said, "This has been the best thing I've ever done. It has been an enriching shared experience which benefits students."

Materials -#113

- o Book Report Forms [now used by all classes] (see Appendix)
- o Unit on Notetaking, Outlining, Study Skills/ Reading in the Content Area
- o Where the Red Fern Grows/Study Guide
- o Journals
- o Vocabulary/Writing/Spelling Program (see Appendix)

General Description of #123 Sophomore Program

Team teaching in this class was done in tandem. The two teachers planned and conducted lessons, interacted, stimulated dialogue and discussion and offered male and female role models as they exchanged information relevant to the lesson. The Generic Teacher assumed responsibility of the mainstreamed Special-Education students in this classroom, as well as coordinating the student's program with other support services and mainstreamed classes.

Literature was taught cooperatively. Teacher-constructed study guides structured the reading assignments for the class. A major component of the reading program was oral reading to the class by the teachers. In low-level classes there is a great deal of embarrassment if a student is required to real orally; there are usually few volunteers. Often a student who may volunteer is a slow, halting, inaccurate reader. The other students are uncomfortable listening to the reader struggle with the printed page. Our approach, two teachers alternately reading narrative or dialogue while the students follow along in their books, fosters good reading habits, phrasing, fluency of word attack skills, and concomitantly, we assume that the

students are experiencing pleasure. "Difficult texts are more easily comprehensible for L. D. children when presented in a combination of modes: teacher reading aloud as learning-disabled child reads silently." 7

The study guides were used for homework assignments or quizzes following the reading selections. When the selection was not read in class before it was assigned, the teachers had an opportunity to assess individual reading comprehension on the student's independent level. Many of these students read with very little understanding of the plot. They often assumed a word meaning that was irrelevant or misleading. Their vocabularies were extremely limited; inverted word order in sentences or inserted participial phrases muddled their understanding. Simple plot sequences were unobserved and theme was overlooked. We found that it required a minimum of a term to read the 200-page book "My Sweet Charlie", in depth. It is our hope that our reading program will foster lifelong pleasure in reading.

Because there were two teachers in the classroom it

was easier to serve the needs, academic, social, and psychological, of these particular students. Students must have felt that they were getting more attention. There were some bilingual students in these classes who had greater language barriers and they also benefited.

Consultation time is essential for planning curriculum and course content, discussing student progress or lack of progress. The team teachers in this class were in agreement that more consulting time needed to be built into the mainstream program.

Materials - #123

- Grammar and Composition for Today
  Book C, Globe Publishing Company,
  1983 Howe and Neddell
- Novels:" My Sweet Charlie"
  "Light in the Forest"
- Voices (short stories and reading/writing skills exercises)
- Vocabulary Book
- Perspectives (short stories and skills exercises)
- Writing Power (workbook)

General Description of #153 Junior Program

The #153 class had undergone the greatest changes since the inception of the mainstream program. During the first year, 1981-82, Mr. Bisiccia and the Generic Teacher strove to meet the needs of a diverse student population. There were several bilingual students, behavioral problems, low-level skills students, and Ch. 766 students. The general focus was on literature. Composition was almost impossible to teach because of the lack of student enthusiasm and the lack of skills. Through the literature program and the teacher-constructed study guides, writing demands were made, but the products were so poor that a concerted effort was made to find suitable materials to teach writing. The answer came in the form of the" Write Me A Ream" program published by Columbia Teachers College Press. The team teachers adapted the program by providing individual charts to monitor student progress. (see Appendix)

This program provided grammar and writing activities arranged in the order of acquisition of skills. The program provided a series of lessons for each skill. The first year none of the students completed all twenty-six lessons; a student remained on a particular skill sequence until it was mastered. Two days a week were devoted to this individualized activity. We have continued to use the program in the same manner for the three years in which the mainstreaming program has

been in effect. Another modification which has proved helpful to severely language-impaired students with visual-motor deficits was to further individualize this writing program by using the computer.

The #153 classes,in subsequent years,came to us with either better preparation or more motivation for writing. The writing program was supplemented with additional lessons from the "Basic Composition Activities Kit",edited by Bren T. Price and published by The Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc. Models of the lessons were given to the students and they were required to develop a similar composition using easy to follow procedures. The students enjoyed both writing activities. They learned skills of sentence structure, paragraph development and mechanics of writing.

However, much work remained to be done in these areas. Many of the students continue to have great difficulty expressing their ideas in writing. The mainstream program merely made some attempts to begin to solve some of the problems involved in teaching writing to students who experience such significant learning problems. We are making progress, as evidenced by

documentation in this research project of Basic Competency Tests readministered to #154 class, 1984,(see Table 7,p. 57).

At one time or another a team teacher had questioned, "Why are we doing this?" Even a student (Senior) was heard to complain, "Why do I have to learn to write? After I leave this school, I'll never have to write again!" Perhaps, she never will. However, for too long teachers have given up on these low-index students. Albeit it is often frustrating to realize that a great difference has not resulted from great teacher effort, but the teachers in this program have been willing to continue to make the effort. Perhaps the results of this research will encourage them to continue.

At MHS curriculum revision and evaluation is a continuous process. The #153 curriculum now reflects the modifications introduced by the mainstream program. The students who went on to #154 the following year would be the first group who had been in the program for four high school years. These students had benefited from the continuity of the program. They were receiving similar structure, forms, and format during the four-year program. What was fragmented was becoming unified. It would be reflected in student development.

Again the strength of the program, that a new teacher could assume the team-teaching position and function positively within the design, was confirmed. Mr. Bisiccia was replaced during 1983-84 by Mrs. Fontana. Her comments follow:

> ". . . I have come to realize that the mainsteaming program is a much more beneficial program for the students than just being limited to the resource-room courses. Many students need a stepping-stone from the resource room.
>
> When students are in high school especially, they need to have a place of pride; being able to obtain extra help without being singled out is a very important part of their education and their growing process.
>
> Another positive aspect of mainstreaming is having two teachers in a classroom at the same time. The amount of material that can be covered is augmented, and the time spent on individual help is increased . . ."

Materials - #153

- o Basic Composition Activities Kit
- o Write Me A Ream
- o"Night"; Elie Weisel (see Appendix)
- o"Of Mice and Men"; John Steinbeck (see Appendix)
- o"Death of a Salesman"; Arthur Miller

General Description of #154 Senior Program

Each class in the team-teaching program was shaped and formed by the triad of dynamics; curriculum, particular student group skills and needs, and interaction of the specific team teachers. This #154 class was more clearly defined than the other three classes in the program. Upon reflection there were several reasons for the clear-cut delineations of content offering and teacher responsibilities.

The curriculum was divided into areas of Grammar, Vocabulary, Literature and Composition. Each area had consumable student materials, either commercial or teacher constructed. All elements were taught throughout the school year. However, during Term three, Composition was taught exclusively. Homework was not assigned. Most of the students in these senior classes worked after school, and many held jobs that required them to work late evening shifts. However, these students were busily at work from the beginning to the end of each mod to complete in-class assignments.*

A motivating factor in this particular class which is significantly different from the other classes is that these students want to graduate, and they know that they must pass this course in order to do so. Another key factor which

*1984-85 Homework is now assigned on a regular basis.

stimulates this group is that many of these students are aware that this English class is their last opportunity to learn lifetime reading and writing skills. Only a few of these students go on to higher educational or vocational training.

Mr. McCallum had structured the grammar and vocabulary programs to provide low-level/high interest materials which required involvement and concentration of the student. Most materials were workbook activities which offered immediate reinforcement and feedback. The course offered a type of programmed instruction. Many of the students read and understood the information and proceeded independently. For these students the teachers acted as resources during and after the silent, individual work periods. Other students read in a cursory manner and did not understand the material and what was being asked of them in the particular exercise. Many bilingual students did not have the reading or language competence to follow the instructions unless one of the team teachers provided individually guided instruction.

The course content and requirements were definitive enough for all the students to perceive exactly what was

expected of them on a daily basis. They were aware of the additional support services offered to them by the team-teaching program. There was opportunity for clarification or additional instruction. There were always two teachers circulating among the students observing progress or errors of procedure.

The writing program developed in this course was exemplary. Prior to the mainstream program Mr. McCallum had established procedures for the intensive writing unit taught in Term III in both #154 courses. The Generic Teacher incorporated the correction procedure used in this program into the writing programs of all mainstream classes. The middle school Special Needs department and psychologists are planning to adapt it to their program. A sample packet is included in the Appendix.

The novels read in the #154 class had teacher-constructed study guides which enabled the students to independently read material which otherwise would have been at their frustration levels. The guides led them through the novels, at the same time, tapping their reading and writing skills: finding details; locating main ideas of paragraphs, drawing inferences; finding meaning of words from context; paraphrasing; writing essay questions based on plot, theme and characterization.

Mr. McCallum perceived my role as the team participant who was skilled in individual instruction by training and by patience . . . a teacher who "works better with this type of kid." He perceived himself as fulfilling the role of the team participant who was trained to use a more generalized approach to the subject matter and the class.

One highly successful aspect of the program was the student involvement in the ongoing diagnosis and assessment of skill development. These seniors were particularly sensitive about their low grades in spelling, reading, and writing tests. As a group they had traveled the low track together since the early grades and had very little pride in their academic achievements. They tended to be defensive, and concealed their concern with a mask of indifference.

What the team teachers observed was a repeated pattern of overt dismay by the students when the periodic diagnostic Spelling and Reading assessments were done, but eager anticipation of the results. As they graphed their own progress, they took great pride in positive outcomes, and a spirit of competition was evidenced when they shared their scores. One would have thought that

if a senior scored at Grade VII on a diagnostic test that he or she would have wanted to preserve his/her confidentiality. On the contrary, when presented with the choice, they opted for public disclosure. Fortunately, during the year most students increased their scores, although some remained at the same level. When the Generic Teacher shared the results of the readministered Basic Skills Writing Test with them, they were extremely proud of their contribution to the program.

Materials - #154

- o Grammar Workbook: Language Workshop
- o Vocabulary Workbook
- o Composition Packet -[Teacher-Constructed] (see Appendix)
- o Study Guides: "To Sir With Love"
  "Dove"
  "The Contender"

III. COMPUTER ANALYSIS OF PROGRAM

Parent/Student questionnaires were designed, distributed and collated in January, 1984. The parent questionnaire consisted of twelve questions; the student questionnaire was more detailed and contained thirteen questions. The first twelve questions were identical in content, but required the parents to respond as they perceived the student, or the importance of course offerings in the parents' opinions. The student responded to the same questions analyzing his own perception of skills and work habits, but he was additionally asked to indicate if he had received support services of Chapter I, Bilingual Education, or Chapter 766, and when these services were offered. (see Table 6)

When the questionnaires were designed it had been hoped that some insight might be gained relating to parental expectations and program awareness; had parents and students realistically appraised student preferences and skill levels? Was there a close match between parent and student questionnaires? Has the study indicated that parents and students should have more involvement with the program?

The results of the questionnaires were valuable. The students gave us information that highlighted the positive effects of the program.

Six questions and responses will be analyzed in depth from the computer-based study.

Question 1: Does The Student Enjoy Reading?

TABLE 1

		Parent Responses	Student Responses
Freshman	YES	80.0	91.7
	NO	20.0	8.3
Sophomore	YES	66.7	94.4
	NO	33.3	5.6
Junior	YES	72.0	84.0
	NO	28.0	16.0
Senior	YES	42.9	84.2
	NO	57.1	15.8

Student surveys indicated that the students enjoyed reading; scores range from 84.2% to 94.4%. On the contrary, their parents perceived them as "not" enjoying reading; scores ranged from 42.9% to 80.0%. (Previous teacher survey had elicited the opinion that for these students there were "no" expectations from parents or teachers.)

When these results were garnered from the computer print-out, a random sampling of teachers were asked what percentage of their low-level students enjoyed reading. The teacher responses had even lower expectations than the parent responses.

Question 2: Does the Student Enjoy Writing?

TABLE 2

		Parent Responses	Student Responses
Freshman	YES	60.0	53.8
	NO	40.0	46.2
Sophomore	YES	33.3	55.6
	NO	66.7	44.4
Junior	YES	66.7	63.0
	NO	33.3	37.0
Senior (Less than one year in program)	YES	50.0	30.0
	NO	50.0	70.0
Senior (More than one year in program)	YES	100	77.8
	NO	0	22.2

Seniors who were new in the program displayed a negative attitude towards writing. Only thirty percent of those who responded enjoyed writing; seventy percent did not enjoy writing. Of the senior respondents who had been in the program more than one year, seventy-eight percent indicated that they enjoyed writing; only twenty percent responded negatively. The parents of seniors perceived all seniors to be more positive in their attitudes toward writing than the students indicated. However, the freshman and sophomore class statistics show the parents to be more realistic than the senior parents in their appraisals of student attitudes toward writing. The junior class statistics reversed the senior(with less than one year)class statistics. The juniors had a strong writing program.

Question 3: How Do Student's Written Language Skills Compare to Other Students at Milford High School?

TABLE 3

		Parent Responses	Student Responses
Freshman	Poor	0.0	0.0
	Fair	70.0	38.5
	Good	30.0	61.5
	Excellent	0.0	0.0
Sophomore	Poor	0.0	5.6
	Fair	58.3	33.3
	Good	33.3	61.1
	Excellent	0.0	0.0
Junior	Poor	0.0	0.0
	Fair	58.3	63.1
	Good	41.7	36.9
	Excellent	0.0	0.0
All Seniors	Poor	16.7	0.0
	Fair	50.0	47.4
	Good	16.7	42.1
Seniors (Less than one year in program)	Poor	25.0	0.0
	Fair	25.0	70.0
	Good	25.0	20.0
	Excellent	25.0	10.0
Seniors (More than one year in program)	Poor	0.0	0.0
	Fair	100.0	22.2
	Good	0.0	66.7
	Excellent	0.0	11.1

It appears that the students who responded are more realistic than their parents about the quality of their writing skills. However, there are probably no students with "Excellent" writing skills in this class. The seventy percent "Fair" appraisal may include many who would be characterized as "Poor" writers.

The seniors with more than one year in the program perceived themselves as having Fair to Excellent writing skills, with 66.7% regarding their skills as "Good." 100% of their parents perceived their skills as only "Fair." The students in this group are more confident of their written language abilities than the seniors who have only been in the program since September.

Question 4: Is Your Present English Class Helping You To Improve These Skills. (This question was not included on the parent survey.)

TABLE 4

Freshman	YES	100.0
	NO	0.0
Sophomore	YES	86.7
	NO	13.3
Junior	YES	93.3
	NO	6.7
All Seniors	YES	87.5
	NO	12.5
Senior (Less than one year in program)	YES	85.7
	NO	14.3
Senior (More than one year in program)	YES	88.9
	NO	11.1

Eighty-five percent of students and above replied that their present English classes helped to improve their skills.

Question 5: Does Your Child Ask For Help With His Homework?

TABLE 5

		Parent	Student
Freshman	Nightly	10.0	15.4
	1x per week	30.0	30.8
	1x per month	10.0	23.1
	Almost never	50.0	30.8
Sophomore	Nightly	8.3	11.1
	1x per week	25.0	22.2
	1x per month	25.0	16.7
	Almost never	41.7	50.0
Junior	Nightly	7.7	5.0
	1x per week	23.1	10.0
	1x per month	15.4	35.0
	Almost never	53.8	50.0
Senior	Nightly	0.0	5.3
	1x per week	14.3	5.3
	1x per month	14.3	5.3
	Almost never	71.4	84.2
Senior (Less than one year in program)	Nightly	0.0	0.0
	1x per week	50.0	10.0
	1x per month	0.0	0.0
	Almost never	50.0	90.0
Senior (More than one year in program)	Nightly	0.0	11.1
	1x per week	0.0	0.0
	1x per month	33.3	11.1
	almost never	66.7	77.8

The homework issue is significant in this study. The teacher survey which had been conducted prior to initiation of the program had referred to homework in 1.00 low-level classes, (see Question 12 of Teacher Survey.) The Parent and Student Questionnaires also included a question: Does your child/do you have a regular schedule of at least thirty minutes of studying daily?

Most students in 1.00 classes were given assignments that could be completed during their closed studies during the school day. It may be significant that all seniors almost never asked for homework help. The high school administration had placed increased emphasis on assigning homework for these classes. When this senior class had entered the high school they probably had less homework than later incoming classes. Also, students were assigned to study halls with no options for released time for the first time during the school year 1983-84. The two changes in school policy are reflected in the homework statistics for the other grades. The freshmen and the sophomores asked for help more frequently and studied more often on a daily basis.

The parents of some of these students may not have been in a position to give the student the help he may have needed on the homework assignment or to help to prepare for a test.

Some of these parents were not high school graduates. Some parents were bilingual. Many parents worked at late-night job shifts. However, teachers were prepared to assist these students during after-school sessions. Many students did not avail themselves of this help because they had after-school jobs or may not have been motivated to make this extra effort.

Question 5: Have You Ever Participated in Any of These Classes? Title 1, Reading and/or Math; ESL (English as a Second Language); Ch. 766. When Did You Participate? Elementary School; Middle School; High School.

TABLE 6

		Participated in Classes?				When did you Participate?		
		Title I:						
		Reading	Math	ESL	766	Elem	Mid	HS
Freshman	YES	61.2	53.8	00.0	53.8	69.2	53.8	76.?
	NO	30.8	46.2	00.0	46.2	30.8	46.2	23.?
Sophomore	YES	33.3	61.1	5.6	38.9	38.9	38.9	83.3
	NO	66.7	38.9	94.4	61.1	61.1	61.1	16.7
Junior	YES	63.1	10.5	26.3	31.5	16.6	55.5	77.7
	NO	36.9	89.5	74.4	68.5	83.4	44.5	22.3
Senior	YES	31.6	47.4	00.0	21.1	5.3	26.3	57.9
	NO	68.4	52.6	100	78.9	94.7	73.7	42.1
Senior (Less than one year in program)	YES	20.0	30.0	00.0	10.0	00.0	10.0	50.0
	NO	80.0	70.0	100	90.0	100	90.0	50.0
Senior (More than one year in program)	YES	44.4	66.7	00.0	33.3	11.1	44.4	66.7
	NO	54.6	33.3	100	66.7	88.9	55.6	33.3

When interpreting this data two relevant facts must be considered. First, although Ch. 766 became effective in 1974, it took time for the program to establish the referral and identification process. Therefore, the class that would have benefited most from Special Education would be those entering Kindergarten after 1974. Second, the Basic Skills Competency Testing recently mandated had created an additional identification procedure for selecting out those students who would benefit from Title I, Chapter I, and bilingual ESL services. For these reasons we may be seeing an increase of services to the classes as they moved from the lower grades to the upper grades. On the other hand, we may also be seeing the many unreferred students who were expected to "catch-up" to their peers in the lower grades, but who were even more delayed when they reach middle or high school and did not pass Basic Skills Tests or experienced extreme difficulty when the academic demands increased in the upper grades.

It had been proposed in the 1970's that once these students were identified and "remediated" that by the time they reached the high school, support services would not be necessary for many of these students. It is the experience of those who work with these learning-disabled students, that they are rarely "remediated" and continue to benefit from support services.

Long-term follow-up studies support the idea that continued remediation of secondary learning-disabled persons is necessary. "L.D. persons even with various methods of treatment suffer enduring skills deficits."8

One of the recommendations of this study is to conduct future research to identify the most helpful compensatory strategies. The goal of support services is to help these students to learn strategies to compensate for their disabilities and to implement the regular curriculum with modifications of methods and materials to match student learning styles in order to enhance their academic development.

IV. RESEARCH PROJECT

Basic Skills Testing:

Pre Test 1980-1981
Post Test 1983-1984

Pre and Post Writing Skills Test

The Senior class was selected for a study of acquisition of writing skills. A detailed analysis of the students who participated in the study breaks the group into two groups: those who have been in the program for less than one year (only participated during this current year); those who have been in the program for more than one year. All students at MHS are required to undergo a battery of Basic Skills Tests in the fall of their freshman year. By repeating the same skills test four years later, we were able to analyze the progress of the individuals within the two groups and particularly the skills development of those who had been in the program for a longer period of time.

To assess the acquisition of writer's skills, the Senior class was retested, using the same test that had been administered to them in October of their Freshman year.9 Milford High School

had established the minimum standard of thirty-six correct responses out of seventy-five possible responses. However, not all students who passed the Basic Skills Writing Skills Test were at grade level functioning.

TABLE 7

(Computer Print-out Freshman Writer's Skills Test Scores 1980-81)

(Computer Print-out Senior Writer's Skills Test Scores 1983-84)

	Range of 1980 Scores	Range of 1983 Scores
All Seniors	43-63	42-69
	50% btwn 43-50 pts.	50% btwn 42-56 pts.
	50% btwn 52-63 pts.	50% btwn 59-69 pts.
Seniors	43-54	50-65
(More than one year in program)	67% btwn 43-47 pts.	44.4% btwn 50-54 pts.
	33% btwn 50-54 pts.	55.6% btwn 59-65 pts.
Seniors	47-63	42-69
(Less than one year in program)	45% btwn 47-50 pts.	45% btwn 42-56 pts.
	55% btwn 52-63 pts.	55% btwn 63-69 pts.

The mainstream program's initial thrust had been for the Generic Specialist to service those handicapped students who could perform in the mainstream by team-teaching in the classroom with the regular education English teacher. The underlying philosophy for placement of the student in the regular classroom is that the Special Needs student is more similar to, than different from, the regular class student. The Basic Skills Test Scores for all Freshmen in 1980 ranged from 43 to 63 points. The Ch. 766 students tested within the low range (45-49 points). Fifty percent of all incoming freshmen in this group scored under 50 points. Lovitt's 1978 study referred to earlier in this report, citing only reading and study skills as measures for mainstream placement, established a 25% cutoff. In other words, if applied to writing skills, the Ch. 766 students were more than appropriately placed in the regular classroom. By the senior year, when the Basic Skills Tests were readministered, seventy-five percent of the Ch. 766 students had been in the mainstream program two or more years. They placed within the lower forty-five percent and upper fifty-five percent of the class in 1984.

What became apparent to the team teachers was that there were members of their classes who had never been identified as either handicapped nor learning-disabled, whose skills were

lower than those who were receiving Ch. 766 or Title I services. The teachers adapted materials for all students with similar needs, with or without educational plans. With the results of diagnostic testing administered in the classrooms, we established levels of academic functioning for all students and planned activities within the curriculum requirements to address their needs. Strong emphasis was placed on reading, spelling, and writing skills, but writing skills were established as the priority.

Professor Joseph Weizenbaum of Massachusetts Inst. of Technology a Computer Science professor, lamenting the low writing skills of graduate and under graduates at M.I.T. supports our choice of priority.

> "What is the absolute first priority for any school system? The first priority has to be to give the pupils mastery of their own language. To confer on kids the ability to speak and write clearly and with prevision. I'm talking about writing as an index to clear thinking . . . are we doing that? . . . No . . ." 10

The team-teaching program provided the necessary manpower to offer the students intensive opportunity to write, revise and rewrite. The seniors had the most intensive opportunity during Term III; the program of writing compositions was the only in-class course offering during this term. Writing samples were compared as an on-going

part of this research to evaluate the effects of the writing program from Freshman to Senior year.

At the present time we have the results of the readministered Writer's Skills Tests and the student responses to the Student Survey to encourage us that we had succeeded in increasing the academic potential of this group of students. The greatest gains on the Writer's Skills Tests were made by the group who had been in the mainstream team-teaching program for more than one year; significantly, the students surveyed who had been in the program for more than one year had a more positive attitude toward writing and had expressed the belief that the mainstream team-teaching classes had helped their writing skills.

PX Team-Teaching Mainstream Program Range of Pupil Scores on Writer's Skills Sub-Test: Basic Skills Assessment Compared With National Group of Students at Entry and Exit Levels.

Raw Score 1980 & 1983	National % Below Entry Grade 8 & 9	Exit Grade 12
69	86	59
68	83	54
67	80	50
66	76	46
65	73	43
64	70	39
63	67	36
62	64	33
61	60	31
60	57	28
59	54	26
58	51	24
57	48	22
56	46	21
55	43	19
54	40	18
53	38	17
52	36	15
51	33	14
50	31	13
49	29	12
48	28	11
47	26	10
46	24	9
45	23	9
44	21	8
43	20	7
42	19	7
41	17	6

(MHS 36 pt. = passing score)

"National % Below" show how students' scores compare to those of a national group of students who were about to enter secondary school (Entry, or the end of grades 8 & 9) and those who were about to leave secondary school (Exit, or the end of grade 12). The % below tells what percent of those students scored lower than the students whose scores are included in this report.

Form a Basic Skills Assessment

Writer's Skills

Table of Skill Development

Group	Average 1980-81 # Correct	Average 1983-84 # Correct	Growth	Percent
All Seniors	51.1	58.0	6.9	11.9
Seniors (Less than one year in program)	53.6	58.4	4.8	8.2
Seniors (More than one year in program)	48.0	57.4	9.4	16.4
Special Education Students (More than one year in program)	46.0	55.0	9.0	16.4

V. SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In the event that this research study had not been undertaken, it is possible that the team teachers in the mainstream program would have agreed that it had been a successful program. The skills levels of the students "appeared" to be improved, and the teachers had a sense that "something" had happened. The data gathered for this research project supported the teachers' observations.

But how well had we met the original goals and objectives that had been listed in 1980?

GOAL: #1. To provide the classroom teacher with assistance for successful implementation of programs for both Special Needs students and low-functioning regular education students.

HOW WELL HAVE WE MET GOAL: #1. The needs of both groups have been addressed and data-based research confirms that there is overlap in the needs and level of functioning of the two groups. An IEP only identifies students who have been referred and have undergone the evaluation process.

GOAL: #1a. To provide the classroom teacher with diagnostic and assessment techniques and interpretation of testing that may be useful to implement a developmental Language Arts program.

HOW WELL HAVE WE MET GOAL: #1a. Ongoing diagnostic tests established level of functioning of students in each class in areas of spelling, reading and writing. Currently used program and materials were based upon findings.

GOAL: #1b. To focus on Basic Skills Competency Testing content and results in the planning of the Language Arts curriculum to meet the needs of the students.

HOW WELL HAVE WE MET GOAL: #1b. A task analysis of the Written Language sub-test used at MHS, grade 9 had been completed. The information has not been utilized as yet. There was speculation that another test might be adopted statewide and in that case the new test would refocus our efforts.

GOAL: #2. To develop accomodations in the regular classroom and the resource room for Special Needs students mainstreamed into the regular classroom. These strategies will effectively meet the needs of other students with receptive, processing and expressive language problems.

HOW WELL HAVE WE MET GOAL: #2. Commercial materials have been modified and adapted in the regular classroom for Special Needs students and regular education students. Support Services offered in the Special Education Resource Rooms often provide the Special Education student additional time to complete the regular classroom assignment with additional teacher supervision. The Resource-room teacher is provided with copies of the regular classroom materials, programs, and assignments for mainstream students with IEP's.

The Resource-room teacher offers courses for credit for (Special Education) students who may be preparing for entrance into mainstream classes enabling a smooth transition when the team approves the less restrictive placement. Conversely, when a mainstream Special Education student requires a more restrictive setting, the Resource-room teacher continues the same program at a slower pace in a smaller setting

The materials and strategies employed in the classroom are of a diagnostic nature. The mainstream classes serve as a prereferral model singling out those other students with receptive, processing and expressive language problems.

GOAL: #3. To develop a classroom survival-skills curriculum that will foster appropriate student classroom behaviors in response to specific classroom demands.

HOW WELL HAVE WE MET GOAL: #3. An adapted "Survival Skills" curriculum has been initiated in the Special Education Resource Rooms. A copy of the adaptation is included in the Appendix of this report. Specified classroom behaviors are developed in a structured format. The original program was in the process of development in Delaware County, Pennsylvania. Correspondence has continued between MHS Special Education Department and developers of this program to obtain the completed program which was to be published.

GOAL: #4. To develop a diagnostic approach to secondary Language Arts programming so that curriculum is developed and reviewed periodically as it relates to student progress.

HOW WELL HAVE WE MET GOAL: #4. This diagnostic approach forced us to match curriculum to students. For example, the #113 incoming class this September "appeared" to be at a higher level than students who had been in this class in the past three years. A Morison-McCall spelling test was administered reassuring the teachers that the materials we had used in the #113 writing program were appropriate for these students also.

In the senior mainstream class last year, a commercial study guide which had been advertised as an abridged high-interest, low reading level edition of "War of the Worlds" was purchased. It was beyond the skill level of this senior class producing great frustration. The teachers further adapted this "low-level" tool for the use of the students by employing less complex syntax and vocabulary. The restructured lessons brought the material from the frustrational level to the instructional level for some students and to the independent level for others.

GOAL: #5. To create a model Language Arts program which has potential for application to other secondary disciplines.

HOW WELL HAVE WE MET GOAL: #5. The English team-teaching program is the prototype for the Social Studies team-teaching program which has been adopted this school year, 1985-86, in a freshman American History class.

1984 Update Team-teacher Surveys: Recommendations

#113 Parent Involvement in Program

A parent letter should be sent twice rather than just once at the beginning of the year, probably in January, at the beginning of the third term. It would serve as a reminder to the parents to continue review of the weekly packets before they sign them to encourage the students' efforts. The letter would ask the parents for their continued support and thank them for their cooperation.*

Parents need to be reminded of their responsibility and most parents welcome involvement in the educational process of their children.

An article by Albert Shanker, President of the American Federation of Teachers, commenting on the success of Japanese schools quotes from a recent study as follows:

> ". . . describes Japanese mothers as teachers. . . Mothers take courses on how to help their children, frequently keep up with their children by reading the same textbooks, help with homework on a daily basis . . . they are totally immersed and involved." 11

*January, 1986: This recommendation has been carried out.

School Support Team meetings are held not only for Special Education students, but also for regular education students for whom an in-depth parent-faculty-student conference would benefit. This is another example of how the principles of 94-142 (The Education for All Handicapped Children Act) has been extended to the education of non-handicapped students, i.e., parental involvement

Comments of #113 Academic Team-Teacher: Miss P. Marie Colavita

The mainstreaming program, as organized and conducted at Milford High School, has created a positive, therapeutic environment for learning for both students and teachers. First of all, students acquire information and improve skills. Also students are encouraged to exercise their thinking skills to develop a sense of responsibility for their progress and success. Teacher feedback is an on-going process. Individual attention and conferences are combined with a group-dynamic approach to encourage good classroom interaction.

The team teachers (1) explore new ways to solve student academic problems and (2) learn to interact with students, their behavior and attitudes.

Shortage of mutual time for planning strategies is a factor that needs to be addressed.

Comments of #123 Academic Teacher: Mr. R. McGee

The sophomore class should also have a unit which involves the parents in the program. The letter could describe the specific book report goals, asking the parents to sign and comment on the final draft of the book report. Studies of this age group in this type of low-level skills class refer to them as "at risk". Teacher, pupil, and parent interaction is often the key to keeping potential dropouts in school.

Comments of #153 Academic Team Teacher: Mr. J. Bisiccia

The junior class team teachers are certified as reading teachers as well as English teachers. Reading and writing skills are areas of emphasis in all English classes. However, the two teachers in this class are concerned about the low reading levels of the students when they reach the junior class. An informal survey places these students in a range from grade 5.2 to grade 10 reading levels, although they may have passed the Basic Skills Reading Test.

Not all students who pass the Basic Skills Reading subtest (probably grade 5 or 6 level) are even close to grade level. Our research uncovered more questions to be answered: Are English teachers also Reading Teachers? How many students scored above or below Special Education students in the Basic Skills Reading Competency Test.

Research supports inclusion of a developmental reading component in the academic content areas. A reading workshop presented by the MHS Reading Department has been offered as a possible springboard. This proposal has already received Mr. Pagnini's approval.

Similar concerns to the #153 class have been discussed by the #154 team. For many of these students this English class is the last formal training. However, the Reading Department of MHS has recommended a course that will attempt to reach these students in their senior year. Our efforts will be reinforced by the new program.

Comments of #154 Academic Teacher: Mr. J. McCallum

I am a firm advocate of the mainstreaming of Special Needs students. During my experience with this program, I have noticed many positive traits: (1) Socially, the specified student again feels a part of his peer group, a very significant point; (2) The student feels more comfortable in an academic setting. He is not a "special" case any longer. This fact goes a long way in boosting the already depleted ego; (3) Most important--the student has proved (to himself, especially) that his academic inadequacies aren't as labyrinthine as first thought, i.e.--He can do the work!

Bravo for mainstreaming!!

A recent article in the Journal of Learning Disabilities summarizes the MHS team-teaching program so succinctly that it bears inclusion as the conclusion of this report:

> "A basic condition for effective mainstreaming is the establishment of environments in regular classes where special needs students are integrated socially and academically with their general education peers, and where special and general education students alike are provided with equal access to available instructional resources and equal opportunities to succeed socially and academically.
>
> As individuals, general education students as well as special education students learn in different ways and require varying amounts of instruction and time to learn. Thus, educational programs that recognize the "special" needs of each student in the regular classroom, and make instructional provisions to accommodate those needs, are a direct application of the principle of "appropriate" educational services in the "least restrictive environment." When instructional provisions are made available by regular and specialized professional staff to meet the "special" learning needs of each individual student, in the same setting, and on a regular basis, general and mainstreamed special education students alike are more likely to experience learning success. Moreover, in such environments the focus is on educational intervention rather than placement, and individual differences tend to be viewed as the norm rather than the exception." 13

VI. NOTES

1. Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Ch. 766 Audit Committee, Ch. 766 Program Audit of Milford Public Schools: Milford High School, 1979-80.

2. Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Milford High School Audit.

3. C.J. Drew, "Least Restrictive Alternatives: Some Educational Perspectives." Journal of Special education, Summer 1979.

4. Skrtic, The Regular Classroom Interaction of Learning Dis-abled Adolescents and Their Teachers, University of Kansas Inst. for Research in Learning Disabilities, Research Report #8.

5. Report of Dept. of Special Education, University of Urbana, Champaign, Ill., 1974, "Administrative and Legal Aspects of the Mainstreaming Issue in Special Education".

6. L. Lovitt, "Mainstreaming the Mildly Handicapped; Some Research Suggestions," R. Heineck and S.C. Ashcoft(eds.)

7. Summary Statements of Major Research Findings: Research Inst. for the Study of Learning Disabilities, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1981.

8. Annual Review of Learning Disabilities, Vol. 2, 1984, Professional Press, 663 3rd Avenue, NY. NY, 10017, pp. 77-90.

9. Form A Writer's Skills, Basic Skills Assesment Program, Educational Testing Service, Addison-Wesley Co. copyright 1977

10. Joseph Weisenbaum interview, The Reporter, "Two Minutes With Mr. Chips", Boston Magazine, (May 1985), 27.

11. Albert Shanker, "Where We Stand, Excellence Takes Sustained Commitment, Japanese Schools: No Instant Magic ",New York Times, (Sunday, December 30, 1984).

12. Margret C. Wang, Eva D. Vaughan, Joan A. Dytman,"Staff Development: A Key Ingredient of Effective Mainstreaming," Teaching Exceptional Children, (Winter,1985), pp.113-121

13. Douglas P. Bilken, Ed. D, "Mainstreaming: From Compliance to Quality ", Journal of Learning Disabilities, January, 1985 Vol. 18 Number 1.

VII. BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Administrative and Legal Aspects of the Mainstreaming Issue in Special Education, Report of Department of Special Education, University of Urbana, Champaign, Illinois, 1974.

2. Annual Review of Learning Disabilities, Vol. 2, 1984, Professional Press, 663 3rd. Avenue, N.Y., N.Y. 10017, pp. 77-90

3. Basic Skills Assessment Program, Educational Testing Service, Addison-Wesley Co., Form A Writer's Skills, Copyright 1977.

4. Bilken, Douglas P., Ed.D., "Mainstreaming: From Compliance to Quality" Journal of Learning Disabilities, January, 1985 Vol. 1

5. Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Ch. 766 Audit Committee, Ch. 766 Program Audit of Milford Public Schools: Milford High School, 1979-1980.

6. Drew, C. J., "Least Restrictive Alternatives: Some Educational Perspectives. Far West Region of Dean's Projects Newsletter, 1977, 1 (1), 18-24.

7. Lovitt, L., "Mainstreaming the Mildly Handicapped; Some Research Suggestions." R. Heineck and S. C. Ashcroft (eds.) Instructional Technology and the Education of All Handicapped Children.

8. Shanker, Albert, "Where We Stand, Excellence Takes Sustained Commitment, Japanese Schools: No Instant Magic, New York Times,(Sunday, December 30, 1984).

9. Skrtic, The Regular Classroom Interaction of Learning Disabled Adolescents and Their Teachers, Research Report #8, The University of Kansas Institute for Research in Learning Disabilities, Lawrence, Kansas, 1980.

10. Summary Statements of Major Research Findings: Research Institute for the Study of Learning Disabilities, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1981.

11. The Reporter, "Two Minutes With Mr. Chips", Boston Magazine,(May 1985), 27.

12. Wang, Margaret C.; Vaughan, Eva D., Dytman, Joan A., "Staff Development: A Key Ingredient of Effective Mainstreaming," Teaching Exceptional Children, (Winter, 1985), 113-121

VI. APPENDIX

Resource Room Support Service Program (excerpts)	A-1 thru A-5
Book Report Forms	B-6 thru B-9
#113 Vocabulary/Definition/Spelling/Writing Program Packet	C-10 thru C-13
#153 Write Me A Ream (excerpts)	D-14
#153 Study Guide: Night (excerpts)	E-15 thru E-18
#153 Study Guide: Of Mice & Men (excerpts)	F-19 thru F-23
#154 Writing Program Packet	G-24 thru G-33
Parent Letter and Questionnaire	H-34 thru H-35
Student Questionnaire	I-36 thru I-37

MILFORD HIGH SCHOOL

SUPPORT SERVICE PROGRAM

COURSE PURPOSE:

1. To provide tutoring and support to students in academic subject areas.

2. To remediate weaknesses in basic skills areas, including organizational and study skills as stated on the students' Individualized Educational Plan.

3. To provide a program of support in which the students are taught to deal more effectively with the demands of the secondary school environment and to then generalize their awareness and knowledge of options to any situation (school, home, job, etc.)

REQUIREMENTS:

1. Students are responsible for bringing assignments from academic subjects to the resource room.

2. Students must have appropriate materials: pens, pencils, paper, and textbooks with them. They will not be allowed to go to their lockers during class time.

3. Students are expected to keep organized, up to date notebooks, including a section for assignments in academic areas. These notebooks are to be brought every day that the student comes to the Resource Room. The Resource Room teacher will check these frequently.

4. Each student will work on objectives which the teacher has determined appropriate for his/her individual needs. Objectives should be achieved before the end of the term.

CLASS RULES:

1. As a student in this class, each boy and girl is entitled to respect and consideration. In turn, they must show respect for other members of the class.

2. Students will be monitored daily on meeting the five requirements on the Daily Progress Chart (bringing a writing utensil, coming to class on time, raising hand when help is needed, appropriate work time, and overall behavior). Students accumulating the designated number of points may have a free mod in the classroom. Free time activity must be approved by the teacher.

GRADES:

1. Students who come to the Resource Room three or more times in a six day cycle will receive 2.0 credits (1.0 credits each semester) upon meeting course requirements.

2. At the end of the school year, students will be given a grade of either Pass or Fail.

3. Unless otherwise indicated, the student's grade will be based on the following:

   a. The amount of work the student brings from academic classes.
   b. Following the student's Work Log which is in the front of the folder.
   c. Notebook and general study organization.
   d. Attitude, behavior, and effort. Good attitude and effort are strongly related to appropriate classroom behavior.

CLASSROOM ORGANIZATION:

1. Every student has a folder which can be found in a designated spot (folders are separated by mods).

2. Students should come into class and immediately get their folders.

3. There is a Work Log on their folder that will indicate the work to be done for that day. Work should already be in the folder.

4. If a student has regular class work to do or studying and reviewing for tests, he/she will tell the teacher. The Work Log will reflect the change.

5. Each student works individually at his/her own pace.

6. If a student has a "Day Off" written on his/her folder he/she may read a magazine, play a game, or do quiet work of his/her choice.

7. When the student has completed the assigned work on the Work Log, he/she will check off "Finished" and put the date finished (third and fourth columns in the Work Log). His/her folder never leaves the room.

8. The teacher goes through each student's folder to correct his/her work and assigns the next day's work. These folders are looked at daily.

9. The Daily Progress and Classroom Effort charts are checked off every time the student is scheduled. Every student has a chart; the charts are separated by mods.

10. Each student also has a Notebook and Teacher Evaluation chart. This is filled out on a more informal basis after the teacher checks student notebooks and when the teacher has talked to regular class teachers.

Note: This procedure has worked out well. The students have clearly defined directions and goals and know exactly what they're expected to do. The student can start to work immediately instead of wasting time until the teacher can meet with him/her. It also gives the teacher more time to move around the room and to work with those in need of immediate help. This procedure also allows the teacher to monitor the student's work, effort, and behavior. The students also look forward to the reward of a "Day Off."

PREPARATION:

1. At the beginning of the school year each student's teachers are notified of the student's Resource Room placement. This notice tells them that the student is receiving Support Services and also includes a brief description of the program. It also asks the teacher if there are any skill areas in which the student needs help in his/her class.

2. The Resource Room teacher fills out a Term Objective Form for each student. After reading the student's Educational Plan, the teacher will choose objectives to be worked on in the Resource Room for a term. The form states the objectives, date started, materials used, procedure, and a column for comments. There is also a column to write the date that the objective was finished. These objectives are changed and updated throughout the year.

SKILL AREAS:

Some of the skill areas that are addressed in the Resource Room Services class are:

Outlining Skills
Notetaking Skills
Organizational Skills
Following Direction Skills
Spelling Skills
Reading Skills
Vocabulary Development Skills
Writing Sentences Skills
Word Usage for Writing Skills
Paragraphing Skills
Memory Skills
Research Paper Skills
Math Skills
Other skill areas as indicated on the Individualized Educational Plan

There is also informal work for student on behavior control, teacher-pleasing behaviors, and communication skills. Hopefully, the work that is done in the Resource Room is applied in the regular class setting. This helps the student find success in the mainstream.

To: Academic Teachers

Subject: Resource Room Support Services

The students on the enclosed list are Special Needs students who are enrolled in the Resource Room Support Services Program.

The main purpose of this program is to support the student in his mainstream classes. it is the student's responsibility to bring work from his classes to the resource room. Each student also works on the remediation of weaknesses in basic skill areas. These individualized programs are written on the basis of formal and informal assessment information. If you feel that I should be working on a particular skill with a student, please let me know.

I will be checking students' notebooks at least once a week and also helping them to prepare for tests, etc.

If you would like more information on these students, please conta me in the Special Education Office. I will be in touch with you throughout the term. However, if any of these students begin to fall behind, please let me know as soon as possible

Thank you,

BOOK REPORT

English_____ NAME_____

DATE_____

1. The title of the book is_____

   The author is_____

   Check one: This book is classified as:

   (a)_____Fiction: presents imaginary characters and imaginary situations

or (b)_____Non Fiction: presents real persons and real situations

2. Where do the events take place? State your answer in sentence form.

_____

3. When do the events take place? State your answer in sentence form. (what clues are you given?)

_____

4. List the three most important characters. After each name add a sentence that explains the role of the character.

   (a)_____

   _____

   (b)_____

   _____

   (c)_____

   _____

5. In two or three sentences explain the meaning of the title. Tell why the title is an appropriate one for the story.

_____

_____

_____

6. In one sentence, state the theme (not the plot) of the book. (That is, what idea is the author trying to express?)

_____

_____

_____

7. What is the author's main purpose in writing the story?

Check one:

(a)_____to instruct/to inform the reader

(b)_____to entertain the reader

Explain your choice_____

_____

_____

_____

8. In 5 sentences list 5 important events of the plot. Arrange the statements in chronological order (that is, the order in which the events happened.)

(a)_____

_____

(b)_____

_____

(c)_____

_____

(d)_____

_____

(e)_____

_____

9. What do you find most interesting about the book?

Check one: (a)_____the setting

(b)_____the characters

(c)_____the plot

(d)_____the author's writing style

Using three to five sentences, explain your choice.

10. What do you feel you have gained from the reading of the book?

Check at least one:

(a)_____learned something to apply to your own life

(b)_____learned something about life in another place and at another time.

(c)_____learned something more about psychology (that is, why people behave the way they do)

(d)_____learned something about history

(e)_____learned something about a career or an occupation

(f)_____learned something about nature and the out-of-doors

(g)_____learned something about a style of living different from your own

(h)_____other: (explain)_____

Give specific details and references from the story to explain your choice or choices. Answer in paragraph form.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Milford High School
West Fountain Street
Milford, MA 01757

To the Parents of _____:

You may be interested to know that the English teachers and Special Education teachers at Milford High School have been participating in a Language Arts team-teaching program, Grades 9 through 12, for the past three years. It is a diagnostically-oriented project. One of the year-long goals is the on-going assessment and evaluation of the student's reading, spelling, writing, listening, and study skills. Pre-testing and post-testing of these skills is administered to check student progress.

It is our belief that this mainstreaming program is of great value for the students and teachers. New materials have been developed and research-supported methods have been implemented. A spelling/vocabulary/writing program, which has been designed for the #113 English class, has been expanded to include parent participation.

The student receives a list of twenty words and definitions on Monday or Tuesday of each week. By Friday of that week, the student is expected to have studied the words and definitions, and to have written an essay of approximately 150 words, using a minimum of five words from the weekly spelling list. The homework assignments and tests are scored by the teachers. Students correct their errors using a method developed by the five team-teachers in the program. The students will share the results of the weekly assignments with you.

Indicate that you have reviewed these pages by signing your name on the correction sheet. In this way, you observe your child's weekly progress and share the program with us.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Barkin
Mrs. Vinson

C-10

Spelli g/Vocabulary List

NAME:_____

DATE:_____

create	democracy	display	engage
criminal	democratic	disturbance	erect
decline	deposit	drug	exit
decoration	detour	employee	expense
defense	diet	employer	expose

---

1. create - to make or design
2. criminal - a person who breaks the law
3. decline - become weak; refuse
4. decoration - ornament; medal
5. defense - protection; guard
6. democracy - rule of the people
7. democratic - treating all classes of people as equal
8. deposit - a partial payment; to put in a place for safekeeping
9. detour - a change of direcion
10. diet - a particular way of eating
11. display - to show; a spectacle; a feature that attracts
12. disturbance - confusion; disorder; interruption
13. drug - a substance which affects the body
14. employee - a person who is hired to do work
15. employer - a person who hires and/or fires the employee
16. engage - to involve
17. erect - straight
18. exit - a way out; to go out
19. expense - cost; price
20. expose - to show; to make known; to leave in an unprotected place

PARENT SIGNATURE _____ NAME _____

DATE _____

LINE NUMBER/SYMBOL CORRECTIONS

NAME_____

DATE_____

ELLING LIST (to be dictated) DEFINITIONS

_____ 1._____

_____ 2._____

_____ 3._____

_____ 4._____

_____ 5._____

_____ 6._____

_____ 7._____

_____ 8._____

_____ 9._____

_____10._____

_____11._____

_____12._____

_____13._____

_____14._____

_____15._____

_____16._____

_____17._____

_____18._____

_____19._____

_____20._____

Write Me A Ream:

EXERCISES IN COMPOSITION

Step	Title	# of Errors	Date	Teacher's Signature

"Night": Chapters 2 & 3

NAME_____

DATE_____

1. Describe conditions of the train. (5 facts).

   (1).

   (2).

   (3).

   (4).

   (5).

2. What does Elie mean when he says, "Our eyes were opened, but too late."?_____

3. What are the instructions given by the German officer?_____

4. Give 5 facts about Madame Schachter.

   (1).

   (2).

   (3).

   (4).

   (5).

5. How did the other people on the train treat Madame Schachter? What is your opinion of how they behaved toward her?_____

6. What did the prisoners learn about Auschwitz, in exchange for a gold watch? (5 facts)

(1).

(2).

(3).

(4).

(5).

7. Paraphrase "the barometer of confidence soared". (Put this stat in your own words)_____

8. Mrs. Schachter had imagined something. When the convoy arrived at Birkenau what reality faced the prisoners?_____

Chapter 3:

9. What happened to Elie's mother and sister?_____

10. What happened to the old man?_____

11. What advice did the prisoner give to Elie and his father? Why did he give them this advice?_____

12. What year is it?_____

13. What was in store for the people who had been brought to Auschwitz?_____

14. The young people wanted to revolt. What did the old people beg of them? (Give the exact quotation)_____

15. Describe Dr. Mengele. (3 facts)

    (1).

    (2).

    (3).

16. What did Elie see burning in the ditch?_____

17. Who is Bela Katz? What had he been chosen for? What had he been forced to do?_____

18. Why do you think the Kapos prisoners beat the new prisoners with truncheons?_____

19. What is the one thought that Elie keeps having?_____

20. What is the only choice the prisoners have?_____

21. Why didn't Elie defend his father when he was struck by the gypsy?_____

22. What would you do if someone hit your father?_____

NAME_____

DATE_____

Study Guide "Of Mice and Men"

Chapter 5

Vocabulary:

Word	Page #	Definition
four taloned jackson fork ( )		
wisps( )		
jeering( )		
limp( )		
ostrich( )		
fury( )		
sullenly( )		
tenement( )		
woe( )		
ringer( )		
reassured( )		
panic( )		
contorted( )		
bewildered( )		
discontent( )		
hovered( )		
sluggishly( )		
lynched( )		
sulkily( )		
sniveled( )		

1. What happened to Lenny's pup?_____

2. What happened to Curley's wife?_____

3. Who discovered Curley's wife's body in the barn?_____

   What did he do about it?_____

4. Where did Lenny go after he realized he had done a bad thing?

5. Who stole Carlson's Luger?_____

   When did he steal it?_____

   What was he planning to do?_____

6. Locate the dialogue between Curley and George on p. 107, beginning with "all right, you guys . . .", and ending with "Maybe Carlson lost his gun . . .". Now that you have found the place, you can answer the following questions:

Who tells Carlson to shoot Lenny with Crooks' shotgun?_____
_____
_____

Who says, "The poor bastard's nuts. Don't shoot 'im."?____
_____
_____

Who says, "'Course we'll shoot him."?_____
_____
_____

Who says, "Maybe Carlson lost his gun."?_____
_____
_____

(Why does he say this weakly?)_____
_____
_____
_____

7. Why does Curley send for the Deputy Sheriff?_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

8. Go back to page 104 . . . Why did George ask Candy to "give me a couple of minutes."?_____
_____
_____
_____

9. If George had not taken Carlson's luger, do you think the men would have planned to kill Lenny?_____
_____
_____
_____

Were they acting in self defense because they thought he was armed?_____

_____

_____

10. Do you think that Candy and George will buy a place of their own without Lenny?_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Assignment: Write on one of the following:

. . . One of the themes of this book is loneliness. Choose a character and explain why this person is lonely and how s/he tries to solve the problem.

. . . Old age is another theme of the book. Steinbeck compares Candy with his dog. What will happen to Candy? How can people avoid some of the problems of old age?

. . . Fate is important in the lives of George and Lenny. What does Steinbeck say about fate? Is the failure of George and Lenny fated? How do you feel about fate?

. . . Do George and Lenny plan their lives realistically? Are their goals reachable? Do you believe in goals? Are they important?

Student response to essay question about loneliness:

Crooks, "the Negro stable buck" is a Negro and therefore a social outcast in the white world. he puts up a front to try not to seem upset about the fact that nobody will come near his quarters. He is described as a "proud, aloof man. He kept his distance and demanded that other people keep theirs."

Since he knows that he is not accepted by the white people he assumes the role of a distant, aloof and self contained person. No one has ever tried to visit Crooks' quarters because the white farmhands are aware of social prejudice and distinction. Lenny was the first person to visit Crooks' quarters.

MILFORD HIGH SCHOOL

#154 English - Basic Communication Skills

WRITING PROGRAM DEVELOPERS: Ms. Thelma M. Barkin
Special Education Dept.

Mr. James R. McCallum
English Dept.

Objective: to improve student expository/narrative skills

Activities:

1. The student will demonstrate that he is able to apply previously learned grammar skills in a structured writing program.
2. The student will complete a series of ten compositions to be evaluated by the teachers.
3. The student will be required to write a minimum of ten compositions. Additional compositions may be written and substituted for compositions with lowest grades.
4. The student will follow steps a through e of the writing process:
   a. The student will write a rough draft.
   b. The student will identify and chart errors marked by teachers.
   c. The student will note high frequency errors.
   d. The student will correct errors and revise the rough draft.
   e. The student will write a final draft.

Contents of Packet:

Objectives, Activities, Contents of Packet	pg. 1
Scoring Chart	pg. 2
Guidelines for the Writing Process	pgs. 3 & 4
Model Composition	pgs. 5 & 6
Directions for Corrections	pg. 7
Model Correction Sheet	pgs. 8 & 9
List of Correction Symbols	pg. 10
Correction Page	pg. 11

Scoring Chart

Composition Number	Required Length of Composition	Points Earned
1.	(approximate) 150 words	minus 1/2 point per error
2.	150-175 words	minus 1/2 point per error
3.	200 words	minus 1 point per error
4.	200-250 words	minus 1 point per error
5.	275-300 words	minus 1 1/2 points per error
6.	300-325 words	minus 1 1/2 points per error
7.	325-350 words	minus 2 points per error
8.	350 words	minus 2 points per error
9.	350-375 words	minus 2 1/2 points per error
10.	375-400 words	minus 2 1/2 points per error

*Remember! There are three steps: 1st draft; correction page; final draft. Points will be deducted on all 3 steps!

Grading: The student will receive a total grade for each composition when the three-step process has been completed and scored.

1. Twenty points will be deducted from the score if the correction sheet is not submitted by the student

2. Twenty points will be deducted from the score if the final draft is not submitted by the student.

GUIDELINES FOR THE WRITING PROCESS: Content of compositions must be original writing; summaries of encyclopedia or newspaper articles are not acceptable.

I. PRE-WRITING: This "brain-storming" step is for your own use. It will get you started!

1. Make a list of possible topics and keep it in your folder.

2. Add topics from the list of suggested topics in the Warriner book--pgs. 295-300.

3. Narrow the subject of your topic to accomodate the length of your composition.

4. List interesting details that could be used to develop the topic.

5. Jot down any notes or ideas related to the topic.

6. Group related ideas into paragraphs.

7. Outline your thoughts in an orderly sequential manner.

II. WRITING THE FIRST DRAFT: Refer to Sample Composition "A Start".

1. Read pg. 1 noting correct form and cursive writing.

2. Complete fill-in exercise on pg. 2 before writing the First Draft of your composition.

3. Write the First Draft as you ask yourself the following questions:

Is every idea related to the topic?

Have I included everything I wanted to?

Have I left out unnecessary details?

Do my ideas flow smoothly?

Are my ideas clearly expressed?

Is each word the "right" word?

Is my writing organized logically, with a beginning, a middle and an end?

Are the sentences in each paragraph related to the main idea of each paragraph?

III. CORRECTING THE FIRST DRAFT:

1. Present paper for first teacher conference.

2. Discuss errors circled by teacher.

3. Refer to correction sheets and symbol page to follow procedure for correction and revision.

4. Refer, when necessary, to dictionary and Language Workshop for correct spelling or correction rule.

IV. REVISING AND REWRITING:

1. Identify the type of error using the correct symbol.

2. Write the correction for each circled error.

3. Present First Draft and Correction Sheet for the second teacher conference.

V. WRITING THE FINAL DRAFT:

1. Use legible cursive handwriting and follow the required form of composition #1.

2. Proofread the Final Draft before the third and final teacher conference, checking for correct spelling, capitalization and punctuation.

Composition #1

Elaine Leeta
February 24, 1986
English #154

A Start

On a cold, bleak February evening exactly thirteen years ago, a red, wriggling scrap of humanity arrived in Arlington, Nebraska. Yes, it was I, but none would believe that my present long-legged self could have ever been that wee baby. I was tiny!

Small as I was, however, it seems that there was one thing that I had plenty of, and that was good strong vocal cords. Evidently I was determined to let the world know that I had arrived on this planet.

Instead of gaining weight as I grew older, it seems that I kept losing. Had not my grandmother come to my aid and made certain that I ate some really nourishing food, I should probably never have survived. On the other hand, maybe what saved me was that the good Lord wanted to prove that only the good die young.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

MODEL COMPOSITION

PRACTICE: Complete the following sentences referring to MODEL COMPOSITION, pg. 1; the missing words are listed below

1. The top line at the right gives the student's _____.
2. The second line at the right tells the_____.
3. The third line at the right tells the_____.
4. The number of the_____is in the left margin at the _____ of the paper.
5. The_____is placed in the_____on the_____line.
6. There is space_____and_____the title.
7. The composition has_____paragraphs. They are indicated by _____.
8. The left and_____margins are about_____inch from the edges of the paper and are kept_____.
9. The handwriting is_____.
10. The composition is neatly written with a _____, not a_____.
11. The word_____has a hyphen dividing the word at the_____of the line.
12. The handwriting is_____not_____.
13. All the letters are_____in the same direction.

MISSING WORDS:

title	below	pencil	above
name	cursive	class	date
composition	top	center	indenting
three	manuscript	arrived	one-half
end	legible	pen	right
first	even	slanting	

DIRECTIONS FOR CORRECTIONS

1. Number the lines on the Rough Draft after it has been corrected. (the title is on line #1, and the first paragraph begins on line #3)
2. List each error on the correction sheet in the order in which it occurs on the Rough Draft.
3. List each error and correction on a separate line, identifying the type of error by referring to the List of Correction Symbols.
4. Write each misspelled word correctly twenty times across the line. (If the same word is misspelled more than once, see Rule #5)
5. Do not write an additional twenty correct words if the same spelling error is repeated on the same Rough Draft.

MODEL CORRECTION SHEET

NAME_____

DATE_____

1. Teen-aged Drivers
2.
3. On a singel weekend last month their was 3 serious highway
4. acsidents in this country that envolved teen-aged drivers
5. one of the result of this trejio weekend were a renewed publik
6. demand that High School students should be required to take a
7. course in driver training before recieving there drivers
8. liscences. Leaving us to believe that we as adolescents don't
9. have no say in the matter.

Line #	Type of Error	Correction
1.	∧ hyphen	teen-aged
3.	sp.	single single single

5.		sp.	tragic (20 times)
5.		gr.	was
5.		sp.	public
6.		C	high
6.		C	school
7.		sp.	receiving (20 times)
7.		sp.	their (20 times)
7.	^	'	drivers'
8.		sp.	licenses (20 times)
8.		frag.	omit "Leaving us to believe that"
8.		C	We
9.		gr.	change "no" to "any"

CORRECTION SYMBOLS:

1.	¶	NEW PARAGRAPH NEEDED
2.	sp.	SPELLING ERROR
3.	C	CAPS NEEDED
4.	⊄	CAPS NOT NEEDED
5.	P	PUNCTUATION NEEDED
6.	⊅	PUNCTUATION NOT NEEDED
7.	frag.	FRAGMENT: REWRITE INTO COMPLETE SENTENCE
8.	r.o.	RUN-ON SENTENCE
9.	n.c.	NOT A CLEAR SENTENCE
10.	gr.	GRAMMAR ERROR
11.	v.t.	ERROR IN TENSE OF THE VERB
12.	[ ]	OMIT NEEDLESS OR REPETITIOUS WORDS
13.	^	ADD SOMETHING
14.	^,	ADD A COMMA
15.	^:	ADD A COLON
16.	^.	ADD A PERIOD
17.	^;	ADD A SEMI-COLON
18.	^" ^"	ADD QUOTATION MARKS
19.	^-	ADD A HYPHEN
20.	^'	ADD AN APOSTROPHE
21.	ant	ANTECEDENT ERROR
22.	H	HOMONYM ERROR
23.	AWK	AWKWARD WORDING
24.	W	WRONG WORD
25.	↶	WORD OR SENTENCE NOT IN CORRECT ORDER

LINE NUMBER/SYMBOL	CORRECTIONS (Identify type of error and how the error will be corrected on the Final Draft)	NAME_____ DATE_____

Milford High School
West Fountain Street
Milford, MA 01757
January 6, 1984

Dear Parent:

A group of Milford High School English teachers have been involved in a Language Arts team-teaching program for the past two years. During this school year, 1983-84, a research project supervised by a professor from Boston College, will be carried out to evaluate the effects of the program.

The results will be shared with the school administrators, faculty, and the School Committee. However, please be assured that confidentiality will be maintained throughout the duration of this project.

Your son or daughter has been selected as a participant in this program. We would appreciate your assistance in this research project by completing the enclosed questionnaire. Please feel free to add additional comments at the bottom of the questionnaire.

Your son or daughter will return the questionnaire to his or her English teacher.

Sincerely,

Thelma M. Barkin
P. Marie Colavita
Sue Fontana
James McCallum
Robert McGee

MILFORD HIGH SCHOOL
MILFORD, MA 01757

PARENT QUESTIONNAIRE:

1. DID YOU KNOW ABOUT THE TEAM TEACHING ENGLISH PROGRAM_____

2. DOES YOUR CHILD ENJOY READING?_____

3. DOES YOUR CHILD ENJOY WRITING?_____

4. DOES YOUR CHILD HAVE A REGULAR SCHEDULE OF AT LEAST THIRTY MINUTES OF STUDYING TIME DAILY?_____

5. DOES YOUR CHILD HAVE A REGULAR PLACE TO STUDY?_____

6. DOES YOUR CHILD STUDY ONLY BEFORE A TEST?_____

7. DOES YOUR CHILD HAVE AN ORDERLY NOTEBOOK CONTAINING CLASS NOTES AND ASSIGNMENTS?_____

8. DOES YOUR CHILD ASK FOR HELP WITH HIS HOMEWORK ASSIGNMENTS?

   EVERY NIGHT_____ ONE TIME PER WEEK_____ ONE TIME PER MONTH____ ALMOST NEVER_____

9. RATE THE FOLLOWING COURSES ONE TO EIGHT, FROM THE MOST (1) TO THE LEAST IMPORTANT (8):

( ) 1. BUSINESS COURSES (TYPING, OFFICE PRACTICE, ETC.)
( ) 2. COMPUTERS
( ) 3. ENGLISH (WRITING AND READING SKILLS)
( ) 4. HISTORY
( ) 5. HOME ECONOMICS
( ) 6. MATH
( ) 7. SCIENCE
( ) 8. TRADE AND INDUSTRY

10. HOW DO YOU RATE YOU SON'S/DAUGHTER'S STUDY SKILLS IN COMPARISON TO OTHER STUDENTS AT MILFORD HIGH SCHOOL?

    POOR FAIR GOOD EXCELLENT

11. HOW DO YOU RATE YOUR SON'S/DAUGHTER'S WRITTEN LANGUAGE SKILLS IN COMPARISON TO OTHER STUDENTS AT MILFORD HIGH SCHOOL?

    POOR FAIR GOOD EXCELLENT

12. HOW DO YOU RATE YOU SON'S/DAUGHTER'S READING SKILLS IN COMPARISON TO OTHER STUDENTS AT MILFORD HIGH SCHOOL?

    POOR FAIR GOOD EXCELLENT

MILFORD HIGH SCHOOL
MILFORD, MA 01757

STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE:

1. DID YOU KNOW ABOUT THE TEAM TEACHING ENGLISH PROGRAM BEFORE YOU WERE SCHEDULED FOR THIS CLASS?____WHAT DID YOU KNOW ABOUT IT?_____

2. DO YOU ENJOY READING?_____

3. DO YOU ENJOY WRITING?_____

4. DO YOU HAVE A REGULAR SCHEDULE OF AT LEAST THIRTY MINUTES OF STUDYING DAILY?_____

5. DO YOU HAVE A REGULAR PLACE TO STUDY?_____

6. DO YOU STUDY ONLY BEFORE A TEST?_____

7. DO YOU HAVE AN ORDERLY NOTEBOOK CONTAINING CLASS NOTES AND ASSIGNMENTS?_____

8. DO YOU ASK FOR HELP WITH HOMEWORK ASSIGNMENTS?

   EVERY NIGHT_____ ONE TIME PER WEEK_____ ONE TIME PER MONTH____ ALMOST NEVER_____

9. RATE THE FOLLOWING COURSES ONE TO EIGHT, FROM THE MOST (1) TO THE LEAST IMPORTANT (8):

( ) 1. BUSINESS COURSES (TYPING, OFFICE PRACTICE, ETC.)
( ) 2. COMPUTERS
( ) 3. ENGLISH (WRITING AND READING)
( ) 4. HISTORY
( ) 5. HOME ECONOMICS
( ) 6. MATH
( ) 7. SCIENCE
( ) 8. TRADE AND INDUSTRY

10. HOW DO YOU RATE YOUR STUDY SKILLS IN COMPARISON WITH OTHER STUDENTS AT MILFORD HIGH SCHOOL?

    POOR FAIR GOOD EXCELLENT

11. HOW DO YOU RATE YOUR WRITTEN LANGUAGE SKILLS IN COMPARISON WITH OTHER STUDENTS AT MILFORD HIGH SCHOOL?

    POOR FAIR GOOD EXCELLENT

    IS YOU PRESENT ENGLISH CLASS HELPING YOU TO IMPROVE THESE SKILLS?_____

12. HOW DO YOU RATE YOUR READING SKILLS IN COMPARISON WITH OTHER STUDENTS AT MILFORD HIGH SCHOOL?

POOR FAIR GOOD EXCELLENT

IS YOUR PRESENT ENGLISH CLASS HELPING YOU TO IMPROVE THESE SKILLS?_____

13. HAVE YOU EVER PARTICIPATED IN ANY OF THESE CLASSES?

TITLE 1 (CHAPTER 1) ESL CH. 766

READING

MATH

WHEN DID YOU PARTICIPATE?

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL ( )
MIDDLE SCHOOL ( )
HIGH SCHOOL ( )

NAME OF STUDENT_____

CLASS 198___